

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Makishima* (JP2001-128113). Applicant respectfully traverses. Specifically, Claim 1 calls for the method step of transmitting, in real time, image data generated by the image-processing unit to a remote storage device. In contrast, *Makishima* does not transmit image data in real time, as the Examiner contends. Instead, in *Makishima*, when memory space (termed “memory residue” in the translation) in a camera is found to be less than a specified quantity, the user is alerted accordingly and an image data transfer promotion means urges image data transfer to a server. Therefore, *Makishima* does not meet the limitations of Claims 1 and 4-6, and it is respectfully requested submitted that the rejection of these claims under §102(b) should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-3 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mikashima* in view of *Fukuda* (US 2003/0012156 A1). As to the rejection of Claims 2-3, Applicant respectfully traverses for the reasons stated above. Regarding the rejection of Claims 11-14, Claim 11 claims a system for storing image data that includes a base station that transmits image data in real time from the mobile communication terminal to the file storage device. Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion that *Makishima* discloses transmitting in real time image data from the mobile communication terminal to the file storage device, this feature is indeed not taught in *Mikashima*. *Fukuda* does not cure this deficiency of *Makishima*. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of Claims 2-3 and 11-14 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Makishima* in view of *Sellen et al.* (US 2003/00121682). It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect for the reasons stated above with regard to the rejection of Claim 1. *Sellen* does not cure the deficiencies of *Makishima*. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the

§103(a) rejection of Claims 7-10 is respectfully requested.

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant hereby sets forth the following distinctions between the present claims and the prior art. In the present invention, before performing camera photographing, an image data storage method is set by a user and a photographed image is stored in real-time in an internal memory or an external memory of a mobile terminal through a wireless Internet according to the image data storage method. However, in *Makishima*, if an internal memory residue of the camera is less than a photographed image or less than a specified quantity, an image data transfer system informs the user that the internal memory residue is insufficient and acquires service contents from a server to inform the user, and transfers the image to an external memory according to the user's selection. That is, as the present claims specify, the present invention stores the image in a real-time in the external memory according to the image data storage method preset by the user. On the contrary, the above feature of *Makishima* is performed only when the internal memory residue of the camera is insufficient, and in *Makishima*, input process by the user's selection is required in further processes as well. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are distinguishable over the prior art of record.

Independent Claims 1 and 11 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-10 and 12-14, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-10 and 12-14 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-14, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over the typed name.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516